

**Steering Committee Minutes
November 10, 2007**

Steering Committee Members

Mark Price	Alpine
Margarette Morgan	Bonsall
C.T. Davis	Bonsall
Bill Collins	Borrego Springs
Abby King	Borrego Springs
Chris Noland	Boulevard
Jim Russell	Fallbrook
Robert Frey	Hidden Meadows
Shirley Fisher	Jacumba
Bob Redding	Julian
Rick Smith	Lakeside
Vern Denham	Pine Valley
Lucille Goodman	Pine Valley
Gordon Hammers	Potrero
Rua Petty	Rainbow
Helene Radzick	Ramona
Lois Jones	San Dieguito
Lora Lowes	Spring Valley
Lou Schooler	Tecate
Gil Jemmott	Twin Oaks Valley
Jack Phillips	Valle De Oro
Keith Simpson	Valley Center
Oliver Smith	Valley Center

Staff

Eric Gibson, Interim Director
Jeff Murphy, Deputy Director
Rosemary Rowan, Planning Manager
Eric Lardy, DPLU Staff
Stephanie Gaines, DPLU Staff
Larry Hofreiter, DPLU Staff
Jimmy Wong, DPLU Staff
Aaron Barling, DPLU Staff

Public

Andy Washburn, Valley Center CPG
Lael Montgomery, Valley Center CPG
Tom Weber
Bob Stuart, The Julian News
Dave Sibbet, Latitude 33
Julie Bugbee, Lakeside CPG
Torry Brean, Ramona CPG
Mary Allison, ECPOA. – Lakeside

Meeting Commenced at 9:05 a.m.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Gibson introduced himself and gave an overview of General Plan Update. He explained that he has asked Tony Lettieri, a local consultant on General Plans, to do an analysis on the General Plan Update and give recommendations on how to best bring the plan to completion. Mr. Gibson also explained that there has been a large amount of work done in the past and the project itself will not change, only the manner of completion.

Introductions were made by the group, and Mr. Gibson explained that some of Mr. Lettieri's suggestions were already being implemented. Devon Muto was introduced as the full time project manager of the General Plan Update and the facilitator for the remainder of this meeting.

II: OVERVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Muto began explaining Tony Lettieri's conclusions, including that the project was behind schedule and overall completeness with what had been communicated to the public. Furthermore, Mr. Muto described some of the reasons for the project taking longer than expected, such as scope creep, emphasis on land use map and no full time manager. When asked if the project was also behind in the goals of the County, Mr. Muto acknowledged the project was behind County goals.

Questions were raised from the group regarding Tony Lettieri, his qualifications and what projects he has worked on in the past and responded to by the County

Mr. Muto described how DPLU was obtaining a consultant to complete a large portion of the remaining General Plan Update work. Additionally, he described that staff was in the process of developing a detailed work plan/schedule for the project, that DPLU management and interdepartmental review committees had been established and lastly, meetings are being scheduled to reengage stakeholders. Mr. Muto stated that GP Update Staff, including himself, will be going out to the Community Planning/Sponsor Groups from January to April 2008, and that the project is expected to go before the Board of Supervisors for adoption in the fall of 2010.

Mr. Petty asked if there had been consideration to change the project name to GP2030 because of the new expected completion date. Mr. Muto indicated that the term General Plan Update was now being used by staff because tying the built out of the General Plan to a specific date was not appropriate. It was asked if not having a specific horizon date would open the plan up for future revisions and Mr. Muto explained that this was not the intent.

Mr. Collins asked if the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission could each send the General Plan Update back to DPLU. Mr. Gibson replied that it was possible, but that the product taken to the Board of Supervisors would have options, such as different land use maps. Mr. Collins followed this by asking if items could be taken to the Board of

Supervisors in a timely manner as they are completed. Mr. Gibson explained that staff will present updates, and that many things have already been endorsed in the past by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Denham inquired what changes will be made because of the recent fires, and added that by 2030 much of the burned brush will have had a chance to grow back. Mr. Gibson responded that changes can be made to the extent possible under state law, but also informed the group that some of the more recent developments fared better in the fires than older developments.

Ms. Goodman added that some projects in the Pine Valley Community are pipelined, and requested that they be looked at again. It was also asked if there were emergency powers allowed to local government to make changes to other agreements. Mr. Gibson replied that changes can be made as allowed by other agreements that have been made. He also followed up by saying he will discuss specific projects more after the meeting.

Mr. Russell requested to hear more information about the hybrid map and boundary adjustments that were explained on one of the handouts and Mr. Muto explained that they are going to be covered later in the meeting.

Mr. Price asked what state laws existed pertaining to General Plan Updates and if the County was required to stand by any timeline during an update. Mr. Gibson informed the group that there is no law requiring a specific timeframe, but that state guidelines suggest that general plans be updated periodically.

Mr. Simpson requested that the handouts be made available to take back to his Community Planning Group, to which staff responded that they would be sent out to the Steering Committee Members and would be made available on the General Plan Update website. Mr. Simpson also asked if there will be community input into the alternative maps.

Questions were asked about whom the consultant is, which projects they are currently working on in the County and what experience they have with general plans. Mr. Muto informed the group that DPLU is currently in negotiations with PMC and that staff will have their resume and current project list at a future date.

In addition, Mr. Muto went on to explain that as the project manager he would be the key point of contact for Community Groups, no longer the community planners, some of which are transferring to other divisions of DPLU. It was asked if groups can still contact their planner if they are remaining on the General Plan Update team, and Mr. Muto replied that he would still like to be the primary contact for Community Groups. Mr. Muto also added that Cheryl Jones can be contacted for Community Planning/Sponsor Group questions, the Zoning Counter can be contacted to obtain zoning/regulatory information and that there are two new tools on the DPLU website to look up information. These tools, a Parcel Search Mapping Application and KIVANET, a land development database, can be utilized to find out information regarding specific properties or projects. In time, the General Plan Update alternatives can all be put on this application for the public to easily see designations.

Ms. Montgomery asked how management is going to be briefed on community issues that the community planners may only know. Mr. Muto replied that staff that is leaving the group is staying with the County. Additionally, it was explained that staff is preparing binders with key issues and archiving all community related information.

Mr. Phillips expressed concern that this is an impossible task, even with his respect for new management. Furthermore, he expressed concern that there was not a planning commissioner present at the meeting, and that the loss of community planners to an outside consultant has the possibility of breaking promises that have been made established in the past.

Mr. Muto reiterated that the goal of staff is to not change the project itself, just the manner of completions. In addition, Mr. Murphy informed the group that Bryan Woods planned on attending the meeting, but was unable to make it due to an emergency. It was brought up that Michael Beck was his back-up.

II: EXTERNAL REVIEW

Mr. Price commented that he felt the interest group was used in equal standing to the planning groups, he described how he thought the groups were used against each other to develop resolutions that he did not agree with. Mr. Phillips raised the issue that the Community Planning Groups are the elected officials in the unincorporated county, and asked to be the primary stakeholders.

Mr. Muto explained that the idea of the technical review is to have more information available on these issues. Mr. Phillips noted that many of these representatives have financial interests in the county and it was responded that staff is asking for input on those that are on this draft list.

Mr. Phillips commented that he does not know how heavily these reviews will be listened to, and is nervous that the reviewers will formulate aspects of the plan that he would not agree with. Mr. Hammers brought up that he agrees with Mr. Phillips, that he feels the interest group ignores the input of elected officials and that the elected officials should be the most prominent voice. Mr. Hammers continued with his opinion that the County should not listen to interest group opinions merely because of the threat of lawsuit.

Ms. Jones asked if the technical experts are being paid for this, and staff responded that they are volunteering. Mr. Hammers said that he was less concerned with the technical expert list, but more concerned with the interest group member's muddling the waters. Mr. Smith asked who the current members of the interest group are, specifically because some of them have interest in certain projects in his community and that the members have their own personal agenda.

Mr. Russell raised his concern with the amount of transit officials on the list, and that he would like to see less. In response, Mr. Muto informed the group that on some issues such as

circulation the County of San Diego has many internal staff that are technical experts. It was also raised by Mr. Morgan and other members of the group that water is a key issue, and should be included in the technical review portion of the plan.

Mr. Petty indicated that he would like the steering committee to review every element of the General Plan, and added that he feels SANDAG has a disconnect in what they would like his community to look like. Mr. Gibson informed the group that this technical information is to be provided to the group, adding that staff knows many of these issues have been vetted in this form.

Mr. Denham asked if there is a plan to reduce DPLU staff or freeze the hiring of new planners. Mr. Muto described that there were going to be 4 core staff dedicated to the General Plan Update, and that although some staff had moved to other sections, no staff member was laid off. Mr. Gibson added that 10 unfilled positions have been eliminated due to the changes in the housing market and hiring of a consultant.

Mr. Davis described that he was concerned with water, and suggested that DPLU issue no more building permits until there was resolution of the water issue. He further commented that residential cutbacks should not be necessary in existing development to make room for new development.

Mr. Simpson commented that during the development of the draft land use map, Valley Center had worked with the County to get a good resolution, but the product after the board hearing did not reflect what the community desired. He explained that the process should be more bottom-up, and that they would like to have faith that the communities will not be undermined. Furthermore, Mr. Simpson asked what the repercussions of the General Plan Update not being adopted until 2010 are, and what will happen to projects in process and to be submitted to DPLU. Mr. Muto responded that the best solution to keeping projects consistent with the General Plan Update is to complete the General Plan, he also noted that new General Plan Amendments will not be accepted unless consistent with the General Plan Update.

Ms. Radzik commented that many of the community's complaints come from a lack of information over an extended period of time, suggesting more consistent meetings. Ms. Radzik also described an experience stemming from an accusation of not following the Brown Act in Ramona, which led to a memo from Tom Harron that indicated that the Community Planning/Sponsor Groups were created by ordinance and can be dismissed easily. She expressed displeasure with this, and requested that Community groups be taken seriously in the future. Mr. Gibson clarified for the Committee that he did not have any more information regarding the memo, but would look into it. He also explained that he takes Community Planning/Sponsor Group input very seriously at every stage of a project. Mr. Phillips added that he has no doubt that the CPG/CSGs are important, and explained that there was an attempt in the past to get rid of the groups, but that it did not succeed.

IV: EIR ALTERNATIVES

Mr. Muto explained that there are two new alternatives developed for analysis in the EIR, and that staff will be going out to the communities in the early parts of next year. There were questions raised on the “Planning & Sponsor Group Meeting Topics” handout, and the implications of topics discussed. Mr. Muto clarified that an “X” in a discussion topic only means that staff will go out to the communities to discuss, not that changes have already been made in these topics.

IV: QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Mr. Petty indicated that Rainbow would like to see a boundary change and brought up the importance of agriculture in the County. Mr. Petty went on to explain a situation in which he witnessed a major developer get frustrated at a meeting and they said they would go to the Board of Supervisors to get it straightened out.

Mr. Nolan inquired how the technical reviewer list was developed, if community groups are able to add reviewers to the list and if the technical reviewers will be required to sign agreements that there is no conflict of interest. Mr. Gibson replied that the reviewers are not required to sign anything, but assured the group it would be tough to push an agenda because staff will be reviewing everything.

Mr. Hammers informed the group of his experiences, and that it only takes one controversial project to get a board under fire from the community. He mentioned that he had a lawsuit for a Brown Act violation and that there is a recall effort in the community. Mr. Price asked if County Counsel represented him in the lawsuit and Mr. Hammers confirmed that they did.

Mr. Russell commented that 2010 at first seems un-ambitious, but that if you are starting over like it sounds like you are it makes sense. He added that I-1 says if the staff and CPG disagree then the action can go to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Denham asked who Mr. Wonderly is going to consult, adding that he and Jim Bennett have differing opinions on many things. Ms. Goodman asked who would have the final say on information. Mr. Gibson replied that he was unaware of a difference of opinion, but that staff would be reviewing the technical information.

Mr. Smith asked for a reading from County Counsel on who the official legal custodian of the Community Planning/Sponsor Group Records, including what needs to be kept and how long. Mr. Smith added that he recalled seeing that the Clerk of the Board could be the official custodian. Mr. Gibson said that he thinks it's the Chairs, but would like to check with County Counsel. Mr. Hammers added that it is a good idea to conform with everything in policy I-1 and keep records for protection.

Mr. Smith asked if there are any dates or timelines other than fall 2010. Mr. Muto replied that staff will be going out to the planning groups from January to April of 2008, and that staff plans on sending out information in advance. Muto also mentioned that there is going

to be another steering committee meeting in January or April of 2008 that will probably include review of the land use alternatives and the Draft Land Use Element.

Ms. King said she would like to echo the concerns raised about water, and that she would like to have other map changes discussed in Borrego Springs. Mr. Collins asked about Housing Map Changes, and staff replied that they are changes in a few specific parcels in order to meet the County of San Diego's portion of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment. Mr. Jemmot raised his concern regarding the completion and adoption of Community Plans. He also asked about the possibility of Urban Limit Lines and the status of outstanding issues that were discussed at length by the steering committee; including clustering, conservation subdivisions, and Transfer/Purchase of Development rights. Mr. Muto indicated that he would like to get into these issues by the end of the year. Furthermore, Mr. Muto said that he will be asking the consultant on how to best complete the community plans as soon as possible.

Mr. Schooler discussed Tecate, how it is unique with billions of dollars of trade moving through it and the need for an economic/industrial consultant under the technical review. He also raised his concern with how traffic is going to interact with Campo and Jamul.

Ms. Jones noted that she did not know what to expect of this meeting, and thought it was good to see some of the same faces. She reminded staff that the Planning and Sponsor Groups represent a large portion of people, and that because each of the communities are very unique, the community plans are important. Ms. Jones also reiterated that communication with the community groups is essential, and that many of these issues have been covered in the past.

Mr. Price asked the group how much has been spent on the General Plan Update and what is the budget for completion. He reaffirmed his support for bottom-up planning, and that the Steering Committee per I-1 should be held at a higher standard than the Interest Group. Mr. Price noted that there have been more calls from Planners on projects than in the last, furthermore, he suggested that the planning chairs get together on a regular basis to discuss various issues. Staff indicated that they would have the budget and costs of the General Plan Update available at a later date.

Mr. Simpson gave his support for staff to go out to communities and speak with them about the land use alternatives; he noted that there are some things on the Referral map that Valley Center did not agree with. It was also suggested light pollution technical experts be added to the technical review committee. Mr. Muto clarified that once the alternatives are established; the highest impact map must be used as the "proposed project" in the EIR

Mr. Davis suggested that staff use the CEQA checklist to cover all the topics for technical review. Mr. Petty requested that the consultant's information, including existing customers and resume be available for public review. He further requested that the Steering Committee receive notification of the technical review meetings, and raised his concern that the community plan text was completed but never adopted.

Mr. Phillips requested that in each alternatives the changes be highlighted, indicated that he did not want SANDAG to be listed as a reviewer of housing, and that he would like handouts a week in advance of Steering Committee meetings. He also stated that other meetings may not be necessary if staff follows the tentatively approved goals, policies and land use maps.

Ms. Lowes asked about the Community Plan status for Spring Valley, staff replied that the department still has the work done by the Planning Group and will be looking at it. Ms. Montgomery asked about the status of possible density increase in Valley Center from the August 2006 Board Motion. It was replied that the nothing has been finalized.

Mr. Brean asked about the relationship the County has with state facilities, as many of them are so important in Ramona. Mr. Muto replied that the County has coordinated with SANDAG to get as much of our needed improvements included and funded in regional plans.

The County concluded by asking Steering Committee Members to let staff know if they have any updated contact information, and to be sure to get Devon Muto's business card for future contact information,